

**REMARKS**

In response to the final Office action dated July 20, 2010, please enter the enclosed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and amendments, and consider the remarks presented herein. Reconsideration and/or further prosecution of the application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added herein.

Applicants have filed this RCE to further prosecution.

In terms of the first claim set including independent claim 1, Applicants have amended the term "condition" to be referenced as a particular condition of interest (possibly, with a second or third qualifier to differentiate the particular condition of interest), with support provided at least by FIGs. 3A-B and 4. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests a protector registering with a detector to be notified of the particular condition of interest, such as recited in each of the claims in the first claim set. Applicants agree with the Office as it states on page 3 of the Office action that the primary reference (Blackmon et al.) fails to teach the registration of a protector with a detector. Applicants respectfully traverse that the secondary reference (Roberts) teaches this recited feature also. The Office action states that Robert teaches this in FIG. 7 and col. 10, lines 1+. *Id.* However, this citation goes to a data structure storing whether a primary or secondary line card should be used. However, this data structure is created and maintained by IPM 302 (col. 9, ll. 64-67), which is not the protector. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, alone or in combination, neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of a protector registering with a detector for notification of a particular condition of interest as recited in independent claim 1. As independent claim 1 recites this limitation, each of claims 1-10 are believed to be allowable over the prior art or record, and Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims 1-10 be withdrawn, and claims 1-10 be allowed.

In regards to the second claim set including independent claim 11, and the third claim set including independent claim 18, Applicants have amended each of these claims to include the limitation of previously pending dependent claim 23 (with support provided at least by this

claim, with claim 23 being cancelled), which recited that: the first protector is configured to register with the detector for notification of the particular condition of interest. In this manner, all three independent claims include this or a similar registration limitation, which helps to focus the prosecution of all claims concurrently. In rejecting previously pending dependent claim 23, the Office relied upon the same teachings of Blackmon et al. used in rejecting independent claim 1. Office action @ p. 26. As such, Applicants traversal of claim 1 and the lack of teaching of Blackmon et al. of this limitation as discuss *supra* applies to all pending claims. Note, Applicants have also added new dependent claim 25, with is a copy of previously pending dependent claim 24 (hence support provided at least by this claim), but depends from independent claim 18. Finally, Applicants, by use of the phrase "means for," intends to invoke means plus function claim construction according to 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph for these limitations.

For at least the reasons discussed herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, alone or in combination, neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of a protector registering with a detector for notification of a particular condition of interest as recited in each of the claims. As each of independent claims 1, 11 and 18 recites such a limitation, each of claims 1-11, 13-18, 20-22, and 24-25 are believed to be allowable over the prior art or record, and Applicants respectfully request the rejections of all claims be withdrawn, and all claims be allowed.

In re SUWALA ET AL., Application No. 10/790,946  
Amendment D

**Final Remarks.** In view of the above remarks and for at least the reasons presented herein, all pending claims are believed to be allowable over all prior art of record, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Office is respectfully requested to issue a timely Notice of allowance in this case. Applicants request any and all rejections and/or objections and/or restriction requirements be withdrawn. If, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney, as Applicants are open to discussing, considering, and resolving issues.

Applicants request a one-month extension of time. Should a different extension of time be deemed appropriate, Applicants hereby petition for such deemed extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge (or credit any overpayment to) Deposit Account No. 501430 for any fees that may be due in connection with this paper (e.g., claim fees, extension of time fees) in addition to any payment made herewith using EFS-Web.

Respectfully submitted,  
**The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams**

Date: November 22, 2010

By



Kirk D. Williams, Reg. No. 42,229  
One of the Attorneys for Applicant  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 26327  
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams  
PO BOX 39425, Denver, CO 80239-0425  
303-282-0151 (telephone), 303-778-0748 (facsimile)